

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Project Name

NEPA Number DOI- BLM-AZ-C010-2011-0037-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Remove one wild nuisance horse from Private land inside the Cerbat Horse HA, 1227 W. Tavertine lane Kingman, AZ, CBHA. Relocate horse within the HA boundary on the west side of Cerbat Mountains.

Location of Proposed Action: Removal location, T24 N, R17 W Sec. 35

The nuisance horse is from the Cerbat Herd Area. Specifically the horse is in the residential area within Vock canyon, 1227 W. Tavertine lane, Kingman, Arizona, Mohave County.

Relocation area; West side of Cerbat Mountains to be determined. Horse will be relocated in an area on the west side of the Cerbat Mountains within the HA that contains other wild horses near an adequate water supply.

Description of Proposed Action:

The removal of one horse would be conducted from June through September, 2011 (See attached map). Horse will be relocated on west side of Cerbat Mountain range in an area inhabited by other wild horses.

A bait trap would be placed on private land in an area where the horse has created a nuisance situation. Horses are enticed into a corral constructed with a one way gate and not able to exit the corral. Since wild horses generally do not have an acquired taste for alfalfa hay, it can take time to get them used to it and the panels before initiating a bait trapping operation. Once horses begin to utilize the hay offered, a temporary corral would be constructed around the bait site. The bait trap would be temporary and the area can be reclaimed just by removing the corral panels and raking up hay and manure. If the horse becomes a nuisance problem again in any part of the HA he will be captured again and entered into the adoption program. A hair sample will be taken from horse for genetic testing and be submitted to the Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Background:

The Kingman Field Office has received a complaint from the people of Vock Canyon (private individuals) pertaining to a stud horse that has been coming onto their private property for the last year. Several other wild horses live in the canyon year round and it is unknown whether he has a band or is a bachelor. The stud horse crosses boundary fences and climbs panels and one individual claims the stud horse has intruded her female horse pens on private land resulting in a foal. Private land owners claim the horse has been aggressively chasing female horses trying to get in their pens to breed privately owned mares. It is claimed that the horse has caused several hundreds of dollars in damage to private property boundary fences and privately owned horses. A letter was addressed to the BLM by Brenda Eggart representing the people of Vock Canyon requesting the BLM do something about the horse

Appropriate individuals and agencies (including those who have expressed issues with the horse) will be notified by phone calls, email, or face to face contact prior to any initial bait trapping of the horse.

Relocate Wild Horse Volk Canyon, AZ, CBHA DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2011-0037-CX 1

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved/Amended: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

HB01/I Manage for a viable population of wild and free-roaming horses and burros to achieve, maintain a thriving, natural ecological balance in herd management areas and maintain and enhance the habitat in a desirable condition for continued multiple use (Page 55).

HB02/VIC Wild horse and burro management on public lands requires maintenance of a herd inventory, habitat monitoring and the removal and placement of excess animals to the public for adoption (Page 86)

C. Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, D. Rangeland Management, (4) Removal of wild horses or burros from private lands at the request of the landowner.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (See Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.

I considered the plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan, and none of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2 apply, and no further environmental analysis is required.

D. Signature

Authorizing Official: / s / Don McClure Date: 6/27/2011
(Signature)

Name: Don McClure

Title: Assistant Field Manager, Renewable Resources

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Chad Benson

Kingman Field Office

2755 Mission Blvd

Kingman, AZ 86401

928-718-3700.



Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review

	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	No.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	No.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	No.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No.
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with significant environmental effects.	No.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No.
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.	No.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	No.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	No.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	No.

